

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

RUFUS ROBINSON III,)	CV NO. 04-00672 DAE KSC
GRETCHEN M. ROBINSON,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL)	
CENTER; TRIPLER ARMY)	
MEDICAL CENTER, DIRECTOR)	
OF NEONATAL INTENSIVE)	
CARE UNIT; STATE OF HAWAII,)	
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN)	
SERVICES; STATE OF HAWAII)	
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE;)	
PATRICIA SNYDER, SOCIAL)	
SERVICES DIVISION)	
ADMINISTRATOR; DAVID K.Y.)	
KAM, CPS SUPERVISOR;)	
ELLIOTT PLOURDE, CPS)	
WORKER; JUDGE LILLIAN)	
RAMIREZ-UY; HONOLULU)	
(CITY) POLICE)	
DEPARTMENT/HONOLULU)	
POLICE OFFICER KANAA (Badge)	
3617),)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RULING ON CASE STATUS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(d), the Court finds this matter suitable for disposition without a hearing. After reviewing Plaintiffs' motion and the supporting memorandum, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Ruling on Case Status.

On February 15, 2006, Plaintiffs moved for a ruling on the status of their case. In the Motion, Plaintiffs express their concern regarding the confusion that exists over the status of their case. Specifically, Plaintiffs inquire whether the case is still open. The Court is not entirely clear as to why Plaintiffs are so confused, as the clerks office has instructed Plaintiffs that the case is open with one defendant remaining.

This Court's Orders Granting HPD's Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 185) and Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 188) clearly identified that HPD, Elliott Plourde, Patricia Snyder and David Kam are dismissed from the case. Plaintiffs also express concern about Magistrate Judge Chang's Order "to cease discovery." The Court will assume that Plaintiffs are referring to Magistrate Judge Chang's Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motions to Take Additional Depositions (Docket No. 190). Neither this Order or any other order purports to

“cease discovery.” Rather, Magistrate Judge Chang’s Order denied Plaintiffs’ request for additional depositions because they were sought with respect to Elliott Plourde, Patricia Snyder and David Kam’s liability. Because these three defendants were dismissed, the issue of depositions to establish their liability is moot.

Plaintiffs’ demands with respect to discovery are unclear. Moreover, discovery matters should be presented to the Magistrate Judges. The Court will not respond to the other inquiries made by Plaintiffs, as its place is not to serve as Plaintiffs’ legal counsel.

For the reasons stated above, the court GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Motion with respect to clarification of case status and DENIES Plaintiffs’ Motion with respect to all other demands made by Plaintiffs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, February 20, 2006.





David Alan Ezra
United States District Judge

Rufus Robinson III et al. v. Tripler Army Medical Center et al., CV No. 04-00672 DAE KSC;
ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR
RULING ON CASE STATUS